

1 David C. Wakefield, Esq. Bar #: 185736  
2 Lightning Law, APC  
3 10620 Treena Street, Suite 230  
4 San Diego, CA 92131  
5 Telephone: 619.485.4300; Facsimile: 619.342.7755  
6 E-mail: dcw@DMWakeLaw.com; wakefieldlawassistant@gmail.com  
7 Attorney for Plaintiffs

8

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
10 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11 **UNITED AFRICAN-ASIAN  
12 ABILITIES CLUB, ON BEHALF  
OF ITSELF AND ITS  
13 MEMBERS; JAMES LEE, An  
Individual**

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

16 **1320 S SAINT ANDREWS  
17 PLACE LLC; AND DOES 1  
18 THROUGH 10, Inclusive**

19 **Defendants.**

20 **Case No:**

21 **COMPLAINT**

22 **DISCRIMINATORY  
PRACTICES**

23 **[US Fair Housing Act of 1988 [42  
U.S.C. §§ 3600 et seq, §3604(c),  
§3604(f)(1-3), et seq.; CA  
Government Code 12925, 12927,  
12955; CA Civil Code §§ 51, 52,  
54.3**

24 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

25 **INTRODUCTION**

26 1. Plaintiffs make the following allegations in this civil rights action:

27 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

28 2. The federal jurisdiction of this action is based on the 42 U.S.C. §§ 3601,  
3604 et. seq. - the U.S. Fair Housing Act Amendments of 1988 (Defendants'  
apartment property consist of four (4) or more residential units), and 42 U.S.C. §  
12101 et. seq., the federal Americans With Disabilities Act. Venue is proper in this  
United States District Court for the Central District of California pursuant to 28

1 U.S.C. § 1391(b), because a substantial part of Plaintiffs' claims arose within said  
2 Judicial District.

3 **SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION**

4 3. This United States District Court for the Central District of California has  
5 supplemental jurisdiction over the California state claims as alleged in this  
6 Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1337(a).

7 **NAMED DEFENDANTS AND NAMED PLAINTIFFS**

8 4. The term Plaintiffs as used herein specifically include the corporate Plaintiff  
9 entity known as the United African-Asian Abilities Club, On Behalf Of Itself And Its  
10 Members (hereinafter referred to as "Club" or "UAAAC"); and the individual  
11 Plaintiff JAMES LEE (hereinafter referred to as "LEE" or the "named Individual  
12 Plaintiff". The Plaintiff Club and Plaintiff LEE are sometimes collectively referred  
13 to as the "named Plaintiffs" or "Plaintiffs".

14 5. Plaintiff United African-Asian Abilities Club (UAAAC) is registered and in  
15 good standing as a Nevada corporation. The named individual Plaintiff LEE is a  
16 member of the Plaintiff Club organization.

17 6. Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that named Defendant 1320 S  
18 SAINT ANDREWS PLACE LLC and is the operator of the apartment rental  
19 business known as 1320 S. St. Andrews Place Los Angeles, CA Apartments located  
20 at 1320 S. St. Andrews Place Los Angeles, CA 90019. Plaintiffs are informed,  
21 believe, and thereon allege that Defendant 1320 S SAINT ANDREWS PLACE LLC,  
22 is the owner, operator, and/or lessor of the real property located at 1320 S. St.  
23 Andrews Place Los Angeles, CA 90019 (hereinafter referred to as the "Property").

24 7. Defendant 1320 S SAINT ANDREWS PLACE LLC, is, and at all times  
25 mentioned herein were, a business or corporation or franchise, organized and  
26 existing and/or doing business under the laws of the State of California. Defendants  
27

1 Does 1 through 10, were at all times relevant herein subsidiaries, employers,  
2 employees, and/or agents of the named Defendants.

3 **CONCISE SET OF FACTS**

4 8. The named Individual Plaintiff Lee has hip and knee conditions, uses a device  
5 for mobility, is unable to walk any distance, and also has a vision disability. Plaintiff  
6 Lee is also a member of the Plaintiff Club. The individual Plaintiff Lee had specific  
7 dates wherein he intended to go the Defendant's Property to access Defendants'  
8 rental services. Plaintiff Lee has actual knowledge of the overt and obvious physical  
9 and communication barriers at Defendants' Property. Plaintiff Lee determined that  
10 the open and obvious physical barriers that exist at Defendants' Property directly  
11 related to his disabilities, and that it would be impossible or extremely difficult for  
12 him to physically access Defendants' on-site rental services. See ¶¶ 25. Plaintiff  
13 Lee had knowledge of access barriers at the Property and determined that it would be  
14 futile gesture for him to go to the Property on the date that he had intended. The  
15 named Individual Plaintiff Lee was deterred by his actual knowledge of the physical  
16 and communication barriers that exist at Defendants' Property and also Defendants'  
17 website communication barriers. As used herein, website means any internet website  
18 where Defendants control the content. Exhibit B states the websites controlled by  
19 Defendants. Plaintiff Lee also attempted to access Defendants' rental services on  
20 Defendants websites but experienced great difficulty due to Defendants' failure to  
21 provide accessible website features.

22 9. The named Individual Plaintiff Lee attempted to use Defendants' website to  
23 access Defendants' online rental services, but had great difficulty due to his  
24 disabilities. The named Individual Plaintiff Lee also could not determine from  
25 Defendants' website content whether Defendants' rental services at the property or  
26 off the property, and common areas at the property were physically accessible to

1 him. The named Individual Plaintiff Lee requested that Plaintiff Club assist him to  
2 obtain information regarding the physical accessibility of Defendants' rental services  
3 at the property and off-site. In response to the named Individual Plaintiff's request,  
4 Plaintiff Club sent one of its members to Defendants' property. The named  
5 Individual Plaintiff personally reviewed all the information and photographs of  
6 Defendants' property. As a result, the named Individual Plaintiff has actual  
7 knowledge of the overt and obvious physical and communication barriers to  
8 Defendants rental service at Defendants' Property. The named Individual Plaintiff  
9 determined that the open and obvious physical barriers that exist at Defendants'  
10 Property directly related to his disabilities, and that it would be impossible or  
11 extremely difficult for him to physically access Defendants' on-site rental services.  
12 See ¶¶ 25. The named Individual Plaintiff Lee had actual knowledge and determined  
13 that it would be futile gesture for him to go to the Property on the date that he had  
14 intended. The named Individual Plaintiff was deterred by his actual knowledge of  
15 the physical and communication barriers that exist at Defendants' Property and  
16 website. The named Individual Plaintiff made a written request to Defendants' for  
17 an accommodation to have equal access to Defendants' rental services and to  
18 eliminate the communication and physical barriers to Defendants' rental services,  
19 both online and at the property. At the end of this action, the named Individual  
20 Plaintiff Lee intends to return to Defendants' website and Defendants' property to  
21 obtain rental information and verify that the communication and physical barriers to  
22 Defendants' rental services are removed.

23  
24 10. The named Plaintiff Club is an organization that advocates on the behalf of its  
25 members with disabilities when their civil rights and liberties have been violated.  
26 Plaintiff Club and Plaintiff Lee investigated Defendants' websites and apartment  
27 Property in November, 2023, and in December, 2023. The named Plaintiffs  
28

1 investigated Defendants apartment property and Defendants websites. Plaintiff Club  
2 member Sharon Riguer investigated the Property on the Internet websites.  
3 Additional Plaintiff Club members investigated Defendants websites and found that  
4 they did not provide equal access. The results of the research from Club Member  
5 Sharon Riguer are contained in the Exhibit B to this Complaint. Club members  
6 ascertained that Defendants' rental services at Defendants Property were not  
7 physically accessible to Plaintiff Lee by a Club member with a disability who went  
8 to Defendants' apartment Property, and said Club member attempted to access  
9 Defendants' on-site rental services.  
10

11 11. Plaintiff Club diverted its time and resources from its normal purposes  
12 because of Defendants' service, policy, program and physical barriers to Defendants  
13 rental services at Defendants' websites and Property. Club personnel conducted  
14 detailed Internet searches to determine if Defendants provide large print, deaf  
15 interpreter, therapy animal, the required reasonable accommodation policy, and  
16 required reasonable modification policy. Further, the Club retained contractors to  
17 investigate said policies, to survey the property, to photograph the property, to  
18 investigate when the Property was constructed, to investigate the Property ownership  
19 and to have an access report prepared. Plaintiff Club also diverted staff to  
20 investigate Defendants' Internet presence to determine compliance with the FHA and  
21 ADA. Plaintiff Club also investigated Defendants' written rental materials such as  
22 brochures, rental applications and leases. Moreover, Plaintiff Club made an oral  
23 investigation to ascertain Defendants' companion animal, deaf interpreter and  
24 reasonable accommodation and reasonable modification policies. Plaintiff Club also  
25 caused a physical access consultant to be retained to survey Defendants' facility.  
26 Plaintiff Club's findings regarding Defendants' rental services and facilities were  
27 incorporated into an Access Report. The Access Report also details the known overt  
28

1 and obvious physical access violations at the Property, but it is not intended as an  
2 exhaustive list of existing violations. Due to these necessary activities to investigate,  
3 Plaintiff Club's time and resources were diverted from its normal activity. Plaintiff  
4 Club suffered injury and also suffered monetary damages due to the diversion of the  
5 Club's resources from its normal purposes.

6 12. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants control, operate, and maintain web pages at  
7 different apartment websites where Defendants offer its rental services.  
8 Additionally, Defendants provide rental services located at the Property.

9 13. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' websites have a close nexus to Defendants'  
10 physical site rental services because the websites refer to Defendants' rental services  
11 that are offered at Defendants' property as well as elsewhere off the site. Therefore,  
12 Plaintiffs allege that the websites are also places of public accommodation.  
13 Defendants control the websites to the extent that Defendants can change the website  
14 content to make modifications to comply with the FHA and ADA. Therefore,  
15 Plaintiffs allege that Defendants can modify the content of Defendants' websites to  
16 improve access for Plaintiffs and people with disabilities.

17 14. In this case, the named Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants failed to provide a  
18 TTY number or the text messaging system for Plaintiffs and other people that are  
19 deaf or people with speech conditions. Plaintiff Club members have a speech  
20 disability. Moreover, Plaintiff Club alleges that the Defendants did not modify their  
21 websites to eliminate non-readable text to allow the blind and people with low vision  
22 to use the screen reader software to access the information on the website, yet they  
23 also failed to use large print on their websites. See Exhibit B to this Complaint.  
24 Plaintiffs assert that most popular screen reader programs are called Jobs Access  
25 With Speech or "JAWS" and Apple's VoiceOver Software. Defendants actions  
26 discriminate against Plaintiff Club, specifically Club members who have low vision  
27

1 disabilities. Each of the Club members above cannot use the websites controlled by  
2 the Defendants. Modifications to Defendants' websites will not fundamentally alter  
3 the rental services provided and will also not cause an undue burden to Defendants,  
4 because the cost is less than One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000).

5 15. On November 12, 2023, and on a second subsequent date, Plaintiff Club  
6 attempted to make a request to the Defendants for reasonable accommodation at the  
7 property. On November 27, 2023, the named individual Plaintiff LEE and Plaintiff  
8 Club emailed to the Defendants a written request for a reasonable accommodation.  
9 In December, ,2023, Plaintiff LEE and Plaintiff Club, mailed a written request for a  
10 reasonable accommodation. Defendants failed to respond to both Plaintiffs requests  
11 for reasonable accommodation as of the date of the filing of this Civil Complaint.

12 16. Plaintiffs are not able to access Defendants rental services due to existing  
13 overt and obvious communication and physical barriers to access Defendants' rental  
14 services both at its online website and at the property. Due to the overt and obvious  
15 physical barriers as alleged herein below, which are required to be removed,  
16 Plaintiffs requested that Defendants accommodate them to provide access to  
17 Defendants' rental services.

18 17. The named Plaintiffs allege that an accommodation is also obvious when a  
19 whole group of the protected persons requires it. For example, when the public  
20 without disabilities are required to get up to a second level, the public would be very  
21 disturbed if they were required to request steps to go up to second level. When the  
22 accommodation is specific to a particular person with a disability, then that person  
23 may be required to make a request, because the accommodation is not obvious.

24 18. Plaintiffs allege that they are not required to make a request for reasonable  
25 accommodation and for auxiliary aids when the barriers to communication are overt  
26 and obvious. However, in the present case, Plaintiffs did make such requests for  
27

1 accommodation to eliminate overt and obvious barriers to its rental services  
2 communications. Plaintiffs allege that providing effective contact information for  
3 Defendants' rental services on the internet is an obvious accommodation. The  
4 general public does not need to request a contact number from the Defendant  
5 apartment owner or operator when they desire to rent a place. Defendants provide the  
6 contact number on their website. Therefore, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants are  
7 required to provide the obvious accommodation of effective communication for  
8 people that are deaf or with speech impediment on their website without a request.  
9 Defendants must make their rental services accessible without the need for a prior  
10 request. Furthermore, Defendants have a duty to remove architectural barriers and  
11 communication barriers to their rental services without request.

12 19. Plaintiffs allege that there is disparate treatment on the internet related to the  
13 amenities being offered to people without disabilities and people with disabilities.  
14 All the below facts and the facts stated elsewhere herein have a disparate impact on  
15 the disability community. The named Plaintiffs experienced and have knowledge of  
16 the below facts that the Plaintiffs ascertained from Defendants' websites. Defendant  
17 operates an apartment property. The property is located at 1320 S St. Andrews Pl,  
18 Los Angeles, CA 90019. The property was built in 1963 and has 3 stories with 39  
19 units. The rent is approximately: \$1,750 - \$2,395. The internet provides a wealth of  
20 information regarding the property. The internet advertises that the property has  
21 amenities that include: Laundry Facilities, Property Manager on Site, Gated, Air  
22 Conditioning, Heating, Ceiling Fans, Cable Ready, Security System, Tub/Shower,  
23 Disposal, Stainless Steel Appliances, Kitchen, Microwave, Oven, Range,  
24 Refrigerator, Freezer, Hardwood Floors, Linen Closet, Double Pane Windows,  
25 Balcony, Pet Policies Dogs Allowed Weight limit 25 lb., Pet deposit \$300, Cats  
26 Allowed Pet deposit \$300, Surface Lot 1 space, Assigned Parking, Parking  
27

1 Available, Application Fee \$25, Water, Trash Removal, Sewer, Lease Options 1  
2 year. The property advertises on apartmentfinder.com, forrentuniversity.com,  
3 zillow.com, westsiderentals.com, apartmentfinder.com, redfin.com, trulia.com,  
4 apartmentguide.com, forrent.com. It is very important to know that on  
5 apartmentfinder.com, forrentuniversity.com, zillow.com, westsiderentals.com,  
6 apartmentfinder.com, redfin.com, trulia.com, apartmentguide.com, forrent.com there  
7 is the equal housing opportunity logo. The plaintiff alleges that there is disparate  
8 treatment on the internet related to the amenities being offered to people without  
9 disabilities and people with disabilities. For example, the tow signage was not  
10 installed. The accessible parking space had an access aisle, which was not van  
11 accessible. The aisle did not have the “no parking” included in the access aisle. The  
12 office had a high threshold. There was no International Symbol of Accessibility  
13 signage. The Internet does not state the accessible amenities at all. Also, the  
14 statement the “equal housing opportunity statement” is misleading. In fact, the  
15 property is not completely accessible. All the above facts and the facts stated herein  
16 have a disparate impact on the disability community.

17 20. On Defendants’ websites, they allow the public without deafness and without  
18 speech impairments to participate by providing them with a telephone number to  
19 call. However, Plaintiff Club members that are deaf and or with speech impairments  
20 are denied equal access to participate because the Defendants do not have any  
21 effective communication.

22 21. Defendants provide websites for people without disabilities to benefit from the  
23 rental services without going to the apartments to learn about the properties.  
24 However, for people with disabilities that require the access to the facility, the  
25 Defendants do not provide any information on the websites regarding if the rental  
26 services located both on or off the property are accessible. Moreover, the Defendants  
27

1 provide the telephone number for the public to call to inquire about the rental  
2 services without providing any effective alternative communications for Plaintiffs  
3 and other people that are deaf or have speech impairments.  
4

5 22. For people without disabilities, the Defendants provide all of the information  
6 on their websites. For Plaintiffs with disabilities, Defendants require them to travel to  
7 the Property to determine if it is accessible, then require them to request the effective  
8 communication, and then thereafter to request a reasonable accommodation to the  
9 overt and obvious communication barrier. Therefore, Defendants require Plaintiffs  
10 and other people with disabilities to suffer a separate benefit.  
11

12 23. Additionally, the named Plaintiffs are alleging photograph discrimination  
13 related to the physical access of each of the apartments within Exhibit B to this  
14 complaint. The purpose of Defendants' internet photographs is to entice perspective  
15 renters to apply online or to contact the Defendants to rent a place. Defendants'  
16 internet photographs only entice people without mobility disabilities. Defendants'  
17 internet photographs exclude any photographs of any accessible features that would  
18 aid the Plaintiffs. For example, there is no photograph of accessible parking. There  
19 are no photographs of the accessible route to the rental services both on or off the  
20 property. There are photographs of the accessible route to the rental services. There  
21 are no photographs related to the access to get into and use the rental services. There  
22 are no photographs related to the accessible route of the common area. There are no  
23 photographs of the accessible units. In fact, all the photographs lead a person with a  
24 mobility disability to believe that the apartments are not accessible, or that they must  
25 have someone go to the properties to make sure it is accessible. However, people  
26 without disabilities are not required to go to the Property to see if it is accessible.  
27

28 24. Defendants websites and Defendants' rental services are not integrated for  
people with disabilities as required. Plaintiffs are required to request an

1 accommodation. People without disabilities can access the websites and the rental  
2 services without any problem, but Plaintiffs and other people with disabilities are  
3 required to request for separate rental services. People with mobility conditions are  
4 not integrated when using the websites because they must go to the apartments to  
5 determine if they are accessible, but people without disabilities need only access  
6 Defendants' websites to determine they can use them. People that are blind and with  
7 low vision disabilities must request help to read the website information because the  
8 printed information is too small, but people without disabilities can access the  
9 websites without asking for help. Plaintiffs and other people with deafness or people  
10 with speech condition must ask for help calling the number on the websites, because  
11 Defendants fail to provide a TTY number to contact, or Defendants fail to provide a  
12 texting system. Defendants discriminated against the Plaintiffs.

13 25. Plaintiff Club member went to Defendant's apartment facilities at the Property  
14 in November, 2023, and on a second subsequent date, to access the rental services.  
15 The Named Individual Plaintiff has actual knowledge of Defendants' overt and  
16 obvious physical barriers, that relate to this Plaintiff's disabilities, to Defendants'  
17 Property on-site rental services that this Named Individual Plaintiff intended to visit  
18 in November, 2023, and on a second subsequent date, but this Plaintiff was deterred  
19 from accessing Defendant's rental services located on the Property. Defendants  
20 provide rental information, rental applications, and other rental services on-site at the  
21 Property. Defendants' agents confirmed to the Plaintiffs that rental information,  
22 rental applications, and other rental services were available on-site at the Property.  
23 Defendants' rental services at the Property are not accessible. Defendants' path of  
24 travel from the sidewalk to the rental services is not accessible since it has excessive  
25 slopes without handrails and step changes in level along the path. There is an  
26 excessive and steep slope without handrails that must be traversed to access the main  
27 gated entrance door leading into the complex. The main gated entrance door leading  
28

1 into the complex fails to have the required smooth and uninterrupted surface at the  
2 bottom of the door. The operating hardware on the main gated entrance door is a  
3 round knob. Defendant's callbox is located too high to be accessible. There are  
4 numerous step changes in level that must be traversed to access the second entrance  
5 to the complex. The second entrance door fails to have the required level landing of  
6 sufficient dimensions. The second entrance door leading into the complex fails to  
7 have the required smooth and uninterrupted surface at the bottom of the door. The  
8 second entrance door leading into the complex is not accessible due to a significant  
9 step change in level at the main entrance door threshold that is not beveled or  
10 ramped. The operating hardware on the second entrance door is mounted too high.  
11 Defendants do not provide the required directional signage as to the designated path  
12 of travel from the sidewalk to Defendant's rental services. Defendant's rental  
13 services entrance is not accessible due to a significant step change in level at the  
14 rental services door threshold that is not beveled or ramped. Additionally,  
15 Defendant's rental services entry door operating hardware is a round knob. The door  
16 bell at the rental services entry door is mounted too high. The document holders at  
17 the rental services entry door are mounted too high. The Named Individual Plaintiff  
18 has mobility disabilities and these step changes in level, excessive slopes, and the  
19 other stated issues cause the path of travel and the rental services entry to be not  
20 accessible. Defendants failed to provide any directional signage indicating an  
21 alternate accessible path of travel to the rental services. Defendants failed to provide  
22 the required fully compliant van accessible disabled parking for the rental services.  
23 Defendants failed to provide a dimensionally compliant van accessible disabled  
24 parking space and disabled parking access aisle, the required disabled parking  
25 signage, including tow away signage, fine signage, ground markings, and failed to  
26 locate said parking on a level surface and nearest the rental services. Defendants  
27 also failed to provide compliant tow away signage. The Named Individual Plaintiff  
28

1 requires the use of a compliant van accessible disabled parking space to safely exit  
2 and re-enter the vehicle. Defendants' failure to provide the required compliant  
3 disabled parking, disabled parking access aisle, disabled parking disability signage,  
4 access aisle, and disability ground markings, such that the Named Individual Plaintiff  
5 is not able to safely park at Defendants' establishment since the individual Plaintiff  
6 may be precluded from exiting or re-entering the vehicle if the disabled parking and  
7 disabled parking signage is not present and others park improperly. Additionally,  
8 Defendants failed to provide the required accessible path of travel from the parking  
9 area to the rental services since the existing path of travel has step changes in level  
10 and slopes that exceed the maximum permitted. Additionally, Defendants overt and  
11 obvious communication barriers were also present at the rental services in  
12 November, 2023, and on a second subsequent date. Defendants failed to provide any  
13 method of text communication with their rental services and failed to publish any  
14 information as to how to initiate text communication contact. The Named Individual  
15 Plaintiff had actual knowledge of these barriers at Defendants' Property that Plaintiff  
16 intended to visit, and the Named Individual Plaintiff was deterred from accessing  
17 Defendants' rental services at the Property again in December, 2023. See Property  
18 photos in Exhibit B and Exhibit C.

19 26. Plaintiff Club and the named Individual Plaintiff desire to make sure that  
20 Defendants' rental services at Defendants' property and Defendants' websites are  
21 fully accessible to Plaintiff Club's members, the named Individual Plaintiff, and  
22 other people with disabilities. Plaintiff Club, its Club members, and the named  
23 Individual Plaintiff all have actual knowledge of Defendants' discriminatory  
24 conditions, and they are currently deterred from attempting further access until the  
25 barriers are removed. Plaintiff Club and the named Individual Plaintiff intend to  
26 return to Defendants' Property and Defendants websites at the end of this action to  
27 obtain rental services, and to verify that the communication and architectural barriers  
28

1 are removed. The named Plaintiffs' intent to return is genuine. In this case, Plaintiff  
 2 Club has numerous members residing near Defendants Property. Plaintiff Club's  
 3 members have actual knowledge of the discriminatory conditions as alleged herein  
 4 when the Plaintiff Club investigated the Property and the rental services and  
 5 determined that the Club members would not be able to use the rental services due to  
 6 the discriminatory conditions. Therefore, Plaintiff Club members were and are  
 7 deterred from visiting the properties. Plaintiff Members were not required to  
 8 actually visit the properties. See *Civil Rights Education & Enforcement Center v.*  
 9 *Hospitality Properties Trust*, 867 F.3d 1093 (9th Cir. 2017). However, a member of  
 10 Plaintiff Club did visit and attempt to access Defendants' rental services at  
 11 Defendants' property. Plaintiff Club and the individual Plaintiff have specific plans  
 12 to visit at the conclusion of this case to obtain rental information and to verify the  
 13 Defendants ceased its discriminatory conduct by removing communication and  
 14 physical barriers to access to the rental services.  
 15

16 **DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN HOUSING ACCOMMODATIONS –**  
 17 **FAIR HOUSING ACT CLAIMS**

18 27. FHA Standing:

19 Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere herein this  
 20 complaint, Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs in violation of FHA sections §  
 21 3604(f)(1- 3) and 42 § 3604(c), as further detailed below. As a result, the present  
 22 named Plaintiffs suffered injury as a result of Defendants discriminatory actions, and  
 23 named Plaintiffs now pray for damages, injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and  
 24 other relief as hereinafter stated. The Federal Fair Housing Act applies to  
 25 Defendants' apartment complex since it has more than 4 residential units. FHA  
 26 standing is substantially broader than standing under the ADA due to the critically  
 27

28

1 important need of adequate availability of housing for the disabled. A potential  
 2 plaintiff is not even required to have an interest in renting a particular property or  
 3 dwelling to have standing. *Smith v. Pacific Properties and Development Corp*, 358  
 4 F.3d 1097, 1099 (9th Cir 2004) [Testers have standing to bring Fair Housing Act  
 5 claims, *Id* 1099, 1104]. Under the Act, any person harmed by discrimination,  
 6 whether or not the target of the discrimination, can sue to recover for his or her own  
 7 injury. *See Trafficante v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 409 U.S. 205, 212, 93 S.Ct. 364,  
 8 34 L.Ed.2d 415 (1972). “This is true, for example, even where no housing has  
 9 actually been denied to persons protected under the Act.” *San Pedro Hotel v City of*  
 10 *Los Angeles*, 159 F.3d 470, 474-475 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 1998). In the present case, the named  
 11 Plaintiffs alleged they suffered the injury of discriminatory conduct by Defendants,  
 12 and that the named Plaintiffs suffered monetary and other damages as a result. The  
 13 named Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief as well as damages, both of which are  
 14 available under 42 USC § 3613(c). Assuming *arguendo* in the present case, that  
 15 prospective injunctive relief was not available to Plaintiffs due to mootness or  
 16 otherwise, which Plaintiffs dispute; the named Plaintiffs are still permitted to recover  
 17 damages under their federal FHA claims. *Harris v Itzakhi*, 183 F.3d 1043, 1050 (9<sup>th</sup>  
 18 Cir 1999) [During the appeal in *Harris* case, the plaintiff therein moved Three  
 19 Thousand (3000) miles away and her injunctive claims became moot. However,  
 20 Plaintiff’s claim for damages survived and was not affected]. In the present case,  
 21 while Plaintiffs can satisfy the injunctive relief prudential standing requirements, the  
 22 above Ninth Circuit *Harris* court authority makes it clear that those prudential  
 23 standing requirements for injunctive relief are not applicable to Plaintiffs FHA  
 24 damage claims. Hence, in the present case, Plaintiffs damage claims survive even if  
 25 prospective injunctive relief is not available. The present Plaintiff Club has  
 26 organization standing separately on its own under the FHA. Additionally, under the  
 27 FHA, Plaintiff Club has associational standing to assert its Club member claims  
 28

1 since it only seeks injunctive and declaratory relief as to its Club members. Plaintiff  
 2 Club and the named Individual Plaintiff have standing with respect to the following  
 3 FHA claims.  
 4

5 CLAIM I: Discrimination In Violation of 42 § 3604(f)(1) - Failure To Have A  
 6 Policy For Receiving Prospective Tenant Accommodation Requests, Failure To  
 7 Train Staff, And Failure To Make The Policy Known To The Plaintiffs

8 28. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere herein this  
 9 complaint, the named Plaintiffs suffered discrimination by Defendants in violation of  
 10 this FHA section. This FHA statute states it is unlawful to discriminate in the sale or  
 11 rental, or to otherwise make unavailable or deny, a dwelling to any buyer or renter  
 12 because of a handicap of (A) that buyer or renter; (B) a person residing in or  
 13 intending to reside in that dwelling after it is so sold, rented, or made available; or...  
 14 §3604(f)(1) [emphasis added]. See *Texas Dept. of Housing and Community Affairs*  
 15 *v Inclusive Communities Project*, 135 S.Ct. 2507, 2519 (2015) [FHA statutory  
 16 scheme permits disparate impact claims, and those type of claims do not require  
 17 intent]. due to Defendants' communication and architectural barriers, Defendants  
 18 discriminated against Plaintiffs by failing to have a policy, practice, or method for  
 19 Plaintiffs to make a reasonable accommodation request for equal access to their  
 20 rental services on their website or at their Property. Defendants have an affirmative  
 21 duty to have a policy, process to receive such accommodation requests and to  
 22 respond to said requests. See *Giebeler v. M & B Associates*, 343 F.3d 1143 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
 23 2003). As a result, Defendant caused Plaintiffs to suffer disparate impact  
 24 discrimination.  
 25

26     ///  
 27     ///  
 28

1                   CLAIM II: Failure to Engage in Interactive Process In Violation Of The Fair  
 2                   Housing Act And California Fair Employment And Housing Act

3       29. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere herein this  
 4       complaint, Plaintiffs suffered discrimination by Defendants in violation of FHA  
 5       section § 3604(f)(1) and § 3604(f)(2). Plaintiffs contend that Defendant failed to  
 6       engage in a good-faith interactive process to determine and to implement effective  
 7       reasonable accommodations so that Plaintiffs could gain equal access Defendants'  
 8       rental services, to apply for a lease, or to allow Plaintiffs to access Defendants' rental  
 9       services both on or off the property and apartments.

10                   CLAIM III: Discrimination In Violation of 42 § 3604(f)(2)

11       30. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere herein this  
 12       complaint, the named Plaintiffs suffered discrimination by Defendants in violation of  
 13       this FHA section § 3604(f)(2). This FHA section states "it shall be unlawful to  
 14       discriminate against any person in the terms, conditions, or privileges of sale or  
 15       rental of a dwelling, or in the provision of services or facilities in connection with  
 16       such dwelling". Plaintiffs more specific factual basis for this claim is set forth  
 17       above at ¶¶23-26 above. As previously stated, the named Individual Plaintiff was a  
 18       prospective renter and Plaintiff Club was also seeking rental housing on behalf of the  
 19       named Individual Plaintiff ¶¶8 – 26 above. In the instant case, Defendant's rental  
 20       services located on the Property or off-site are "services" in connection with the  
 21       rental of a dwelling and the on-site or off-site rental services provided fall within the  
 22       FHA statute. In the instant case, the named Plaintiffs both assert that Defendant's  
 23       failure to remove communication and architectural barriers to permit access to  
 24       Defendant's on-site rental services contained is a separate, independent, actionable  
 25       violation of this FHA section § 3604(f)(2), even without reference to the ADA as a  
 26       predicate. Plaintiffs have alleged that Defendants' Property has overt and obvious  
 27       physical barriers to access its rental services provided at the property. See ¶¶25 -26.  
 28

1 The 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit *Smith* court stated that the mere observation of overt architectural  
 2 barriers is actionable. *Smith* at 1104 [“To read an additional standing requirement  
 3 into the statute beyond mere observation, however, ignores that many overtly  
 4 discriminatory conditions, for example, lack of a ramped entryway, prohibit a  
 5 disabled individual from forming the requisite intent or actual interest in renting or  
 6 buying *for the very reason* that architectural barriers prevent them from viewing the  
 7 whole property in the first instance” (emphasis in original)]. The *Smith* court found  
 8 Defendants liable under this FHA subsection even though that case did not involve  
 9 ADA Title III claims. However, Plaintiffs did not just allege that Plaintiff Club  
 10 observed Defendant’s overt architectural barriers, but Plaintiffs alleged that a  
 11 Plaintiff Club member experienced the barriers, that the named Individual Plaintiff  
 12 had actual knowledge of Defendants’ communication and architectural barriers and  
 13 Plaintiff LEE was deterred from obtaining equal access to Defendant’s rental  
 14 services located thereon. Defendants also discriminated against Plaintiffs by failing  
 15 to modify its practices and policies to provide access via other methods of access to  
 16 its rental services located on or off the property site. Defendant’s failure to remove  
 17 the architectural and communication barriers to access its facilities and the rental  
 18 services located thereon, or failure to provide an accommodation to provide methods  
 19 of alternate access to their rental services, constitutes the prohibited discrimination,  
 20 separately and independently. Additionally, Defendant’s conduct is also prohibited  
 21 under ADA Title III and constitutes a second, separate, independent source of  
 22 discrimination against Plaintiffs in violation of FHA § 3604(f)(2). Since Defendants  
 23 discriminatory conduct involves Defendants’ rental facilities and its rental services  
 24 located therein, Plaintiffs assert any discriminatory conduct found in violation of  
 25 ADA Title III also constitutes prohibited “discrimination” under FHA § 3604(f)(2).

**26 CLAIM IV: Discrimination In Violation of 42 § 3604(f)(3)(A and B only)**

**27 31. Plaintiffs do not make any claim against Defendants for a failure to “design**

1 and construct" pursuant to § 3604(f)(3)(C). Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26  
 2 above and elsewhere herein this complaint, Plaintiffs suffered discrimination by  
 3 Defendants in violation of FHA sections § 3604(f)(3)(A, B) only. The FHA requires  
 4 that "....[f]or the purposes of this subsection, discrimination includes-- (B) a refusal  
 5 to make reasonable accommodations in rules, policies, practices, or services, when  
 6 such accommodations may be necessary to afford such person equal opportunity to  
 7 use and enjoy a dwelling..." 42 § 3604(f)(3)(B). See also *Giebeler v. M & B*  
 8 *Associates*, 343 F.3d 1143 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 2003). Defendants improperly refused Plaintiffs'  
 9 repeated written and other requests for an accommodation to have equal access to its  
 10 rental services.

11 **CLAIM V: Discrimination In Violation of 42 § 3604(c) As To NSA**

12 32. Based on information, belief, and the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 – 26 above and  
 13 elsewhere herein, Plaintiffs herein alleges that Defendants caused Plaintiffs to suffer  
 14 the injury of discrimination since Defendants violated 42 U.S.C. §§ 3604 (c) with  
 15 respect to its notices, statements, and advertisements ("NSA"). Plaintiffs allege that  
 16 Defendants discriminated against them when Defendants made, printed, or  
 17 published, or caused to be made printed, or published notices, statements, or  
 18 advertisements ("NSA") that suggest to an ordinary reader a preference to attract  
 19 tenants without disabilities. Defendants' Internet advertising regarding its rental  
 20 services has an unlawful disparate impact on Plaintiffs.

22 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION : Violation of California Fair Housing Act**

23 33. Failure to Provide Obvious Reasonable Accommodation and Modification:  
 24 Based on information, belief and the facts stated above at ¶¶ 8 – 26 above and  
 25 elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants refused to make  
 26 reasonable accommodations in rules, policies, practices, or services in violation of

1 CA Government Code sections 12927 and 12955.2, when these accommodations  
 2 may be necessary to afford a disabled person equal opportunity to use and enjoy  
 3 Defendants' rental services. As stated in detail above, Defendants refused to make  
 4 reasonable accommodations with the instant Plaintiffs and discriminated against each  
 5 of them on the basis of disability.

6

7 THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS- Claims Under  
 8 The Americans With Disabilities Act Of 1990

9 34. ADA Standing:

10 ADA Title III does cover public and common use areas at housing  
 11 developments when these public areas are, by their nature, open to the general  
 12 public. An office providing rental services is open to the general public. (See U.S.  
 13 Department of Justice - ADA Title III Technical Assistance Section III-1.2000,  
 14 Illustration 3, office on or off the site covered). The parking and paths of travel to  
 15 the office on or off the site are also covered. *See* Section III-1.2000, ADA Title III  
 16 Technical Assistance Manual, <http://www.ada.gov/taman3.html> ("ILLUSTRATION  
 17 3: A private residential apartment complex contains a office on or off the site. The  
 18 office on or off the site is a place of public accommodation"). *See Kalani v Castle*  
*Village, LLC*, 14 F.Supp.3d 1359, 1371 (E.D.Cal, 2014) [citing *Johnson v. Laura*  
*Dawn Apartments, LLC*, 2012 WL 33040 at \*1 n. 1 (E.D.Cal.2012) (Hollows, M.J.)  
 20 ("[t]he leasing office of an apartment is a place of public accommodation.] . In the  
 21 present case, the named Plaintiffs have also sufficiently alleged that Defendants  
 22 provide rental services at the property. Following prior sister Circuit Courts of  
 23 Appeals decisions, our Ninth Circuit Court very recently held that an ADA Plaintiff  
 24 can be only a "tester" and have standing. *See Civil Rights Education & Enforcement*  
*Center v. Hospitality Properties Trust*, 867 F.3d 1093 (9th Cir. 2017) [the Ninth  
 26 Circuit CREEC court held (1) ADA "tester" standing is valid and a Plaintiff's  
 27

1 motivation for visit is “irrelevant”, and (2) an ADA “deterrent effect doctrine” claim  
 2 does not require a Plaintiff to have a personal encounter with the barrier to equal  
 3 access, only to have knowledge of the barrier] citing *Havens Realty Corp. v.*  
 4 *Coleman*, 455 U.S. 363, 372–74, 102 S.Ct. 1114 (1982); *Smith v. Pacific Properties*  
 5 and *Development Corp*, 358 F.3d 1097, 1102-1104 (9th Cir 2004); *Chapman v. Pier*  
 6 *1 Imports (U.S.) Inc.*, 631 F.3d 939 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 2011, en banc); *Houston v. Marod*  
 7 *Supermarkets, Inc.*, 733 F.3d 1323, 1335–37 (11th Cir. 2013); *Colo. Cross Disability*  
 8 *Coal. v. Abercrombie & Fitch Co.*, 765 F.3d 1205, 1210–11 (10th Cir. 2014). In the  
 9 present case, the named Plaintiffs each have ADA standing. Plaintiffs have alleged  
 10 that Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs in violation of ADA Title III statutes  
 11 and regulations as detailed further in the ADA claims stated below. As a result, the  
 12 named Plaintiffs have each suffered injury and each seek only injunctive and  
 13 declaratory relief pursuant to their ADA Claims.

14 **CLAIM I: Auxiliary Aids – Failure To Effectively Communicate**

15 35. 42 United States Code 12182(b)(2)(iii) states, "a failure to take such steps as  
 16 may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied  
 17 services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of  
 18 the absence of auxiliary aids and services, unless the entity can demonstrate that  
 19 taking such steps would fundamentally alter the nature of the good, service, facility,  
 20 privilege, advantage, or accommodation being offered or would result in an undue  
 21 burden;..." Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this  
 22 complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants  
 23 violated said provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most  
 24 specifically at ¶¶ 13 -14, 16-24 above. The ADA “applies to the services of a place  
 25 of public accommodation, not services *in* a place of public accommodation. To limit  
 26 the ADA to discrimination in the provision of services occurring on the premises of a

1 public accommodation would contradict the plain language of the statute.” Nat’l  
 2 Fed’n of the Blind v. Target Corp., 452 F. Supp. 2d 946, 953 (N.D. Cal. 2006)  
 3 (emphasis added) (citing *Weyer v. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp.*, 198 F.3d  
 4 1104, 1115 (9th Cir. 2000) [holding that “whatever goods or services the place  
 5 provides, it cannot discriminate on the basis of disability in providing enjoyment of  
 6 those goods and services”]). An ADA plaintiff may challenge a business’ online  
 7 offerings as well. So long as there is a “nexus”—that is, “some connection between  
 8 the good or service complained of and an actual physical place”—a plaintiff may  
 9 challenge the digital offerings of an otherwise physical business. *See Gorecki v.*  
 10 *Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 2017 WL 2957736, at \*4 (C.D. Cal. June 15, 2017) [Case:  
 11 CV 17-1131-JFW (SKx)]. The ADA requires the Defendants to provide effective  
 12 communication to the instant Plaintiffs and to people with disabilities. In the  
 13 present case, Plaintiffs experienced and have knowledge that Defendants failed to  
 14 have a required procedure to provide effective communication. Plaintiffs allege that  
 15 Defendants failed to train their staff on the way to use the auxiliary aids. Defendants  
 16 did not provide any auxiliary aid and the Defendants did not provide any reasonable  
 17 accommodation to the overt and obvious communication barriers, and failed to  
 18 respond to Plaintiffs’ requests for accommodation. Plaintiffs are not demanding that  
 19 Defendants provide a specific reasonable accommodation or a specific auxiliary aid.  
 20 ADA law allows the Defendants to decide what auxiliary aid and reasonable  
 21 accommodation will be provided. In this case, however, Defendants failed to  
 22 provide any reasonable accommodation for the overt and obvious communication  
 23 barriers to equal access to their rental services, failed to provide any auxiliary aid,  
 24 and failed to provide any effective communication. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants’  
 25 websites provide a contact number for the general public, but Defendants failed to  
 26 provide Plaintiffs with the required effective communication using texting or other  
 27

1 alternate means of communication for Plaintiffs and other people with a deaf  
 2 condition or a speech condition. Defendants' conduct discriminates against Plaintiff  
 3 Club's members that have hearing disabilities and Club's members with speech  
 4 disabilities. Defendants are required to provide, on Defendants' websites, to provide  
 5 a method to effectively communicate with Plaintiff Club members that have hearing  
 6 and speech disabilities, and other people that are deaf or have speech impairments.  
 7

8 **CLAIM II: Denial of Participation**

9 36. 42 United States Code 12182(b)(1)(A)(i) states, "It shall be discriminatory to  
 10 subject an individual or class of individuals on the basis of a disability or disabilities  
 11 of such individual or class, directly, or through contractual, licensing, or other  
 12 arrangements, to a denial of the opportunity of the individual or class to participate in  
 13 or benefit from the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or  
 14 accommodations of an entity." Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and  
 15 elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that  
 16 Defendants violated said provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim  
 17 most specifically at ¶¶ 20-24 above. Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs in  
 18 violation of 42 United States Code 12182(b)(1)(A)(i) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188.

19 **CLAIM III: Participation in Unequal Benefit**

20 37. Defendants provide unequal benefit for people with disabilities in violation of  
 21 42 United States Code 12182(b)(1)(A)(ii) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188. Based on the facts  
 22 plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed,  
 23 believe, and thereon allege that Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs in  
 24 violation of said provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most  
 25 specifically at ¶¶ 20-24 above.

26 **CLAIM IV: Separate Benefit**

27 38. Defendants' photographs discriminate against Plaintiffs in violation of 42

1 United States Code 12182(b)(2)(A)(iii) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188. Based on the facts  
 2 plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed,  
 3 believe, and thereon allege that Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs in  
 4 violation of said provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most  
 5 specifically at ¶¶ 20-24 above.

6 **CLAIM V: Integrated Settings**

7 39. Defendants' rental services are not integrated for Plaintiffs and people with  
 8 disabilities in violation of 42 United States Code 12182(b)(1)(B) and 42 U.S.C. §  
 9 12188. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint,  
 10 Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants discriminated  
 11 against Plaintiffs in violation of said provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis  
 12 for this claim most specifically at ¶¶ 20-24 above.

13 **CLAIM VI: Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures**

14 40. Defendants failed and refused to provide a reasonable alternative by  
 15 modifying its practices, policies, and procedures in that they failed to have a scheme,  
 16 plan, or design to accommodate Plaintiff Club, its Club members, the individual  
 17 named Plaintiff, and/or others similarly situated in utilizing Defendants' rental  
 18 services, at its websites and at the Property, in violation of 42 United States Code  
 19 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26  
 20 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon  
 21 allege that Defendants discriminated against Plaintiffs in violation of said provision.  
 22 Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most specifically at ¶¶ 18-26 above.

23 **CLAIM VII: Failure To Remove Architectural And Communication Barriers**

24 41. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to remove architectural barrier and  
 25 communication barriers as required in violation of 42 United States Code  
 26 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and 42 U.S.C. § 12182. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26

27

1 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon  
2 allege that Defendants discriminated against the named Individual Plaintiff in  
3 violation of said provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most  
4 specifically at ¶¶ 8,9,20-24,25,26 above. The named Individual Plaintiff personally  
5 reviewed all the information and photographs of Defendants' property. As a result,  
6 the named Individual Plaintiff has actual knowledge of the physical and  
7 communication barriers that exist at Defendants' Property. The named Individual  
8 Plaintiff determined that the physical barriers that exist at Defendants' property,  
9 directly relate to his disabilities, and make it impossible or extremely difficult for  
10 him to physically access Defendants' rental services at the Property. The named  
11 Individual Plaintiff was deterred by his actual knowledge of the physical and  
12 communication barriers that exist at Defendants' Property which include but are not  
13 limited to the barriers to facilities and services for disabled parking, exterior path of  
14 travel to the rental services at the property, entrance and interior, since said  
15 Defendants' facilities and rental services were not accessible because they failed to  
16 comply with the Federal ADA Accessibility Guidelines ("ADAAG") and California's  
17 Title 24 Building Code Requirements. See ¶¶ 25 for details. The named Individual  
18 Plaintiff had actual knowledge of these barriers and determined that it would be  
19 futile gesture for him to go to the Property on the date that he had originally  
20 intended. The named Individual Plaintiff is currently deterred from returning due to  
21 his knowledge of the barriers. At the end of this action, the named Individual  
22 Plaintiff intends to return to Defendants' property or off the site location to obtain  
23 rental information and verify that the communication and physical barriers to  
24 Defendants' rental services are removed. Defendants failure to remove the barriers  
25 to equal access constitutes discrimination against the named Individual Plaintiff.

26 **CLAIM VIII: Failure To Make Alterations Readily Accessible And Usable**

27 42. Defendants are required to make alterations to their facilities in such a manner

1 that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily  
 2 accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who  
 3 use devices pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §12183(a)(2). Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 -  
 4 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint, the named Plaintiffs are informed, believe,  
 5 and thereon allege that Defendants violated this provision. Plaintiffs allege that  
 6 Defendants altered their facility in a manner that affects or could affect the usability  
 7 of the facility or a part of the facility after January 26, 1992. In performing the  
 8 alteration, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to make the alteration in such a  
 9 manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are  
 10 readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals  
 11 who use devices, in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12183(a)(2).  
 12

13 **CLAIM IX: Administrative Methods**

14 43. Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants contract  
 15 with website providers without making sure that the websites will be accessible to  
 16 people with disabilities in violation of 42 United States Code 12182(b)(1)(B) and 42  
 17 U.S.C. § 12188. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this  
 18 complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants  
 19 discriminated against the named Individual Plaintiff in violation of said provision.  
 20 Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most specifically at ¶¶18-26 above.

21 **CLAIM X: Screen Out**

22 44. Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants screened  
 23 out Plaintiffs and other people with disabilities in violation of 42 United States Code  
 24 12182(b)(2)(A)(i) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26  
 25 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon  
 26 allege that Defendants discriminated against the named Plaintiffs in violation of said  
 27 provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most specifically at ¶¶ 8  
 28

1 - 26 above. Defendants screened out the named Plaintiffs from its rental services and  
2 processes, because Defendants failed to remove architectural and communication  
3 barriers to its website and property, failed to provide required effective alternate  
4 communication methods, and failed to provide required auxiliary aids.  
5

6 **CLAIM XI: Denial Of Full And Equal Access**

7 45. Defendants are required to provide full and equal access to Defendants' rental  
8 services, goods, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations pursuant to 42  
9 United States Code 12182(b) and 42 U.S.C. § 12188. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶  
10 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint, Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and  
11 thereon allege that Defendants discriminated against the named Plaintiffs in violation  
12 of said provision. Plaintiffs set forth the factual basis for this claim most specifically  
13 at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above.  
14

15 **CLAIM XII: Failure To Investigate And Maintain Accessible Features**

16 46. Defendants made repairs and administrative changes which violated ADA and  
17 its regulations. See ADA Title III Regulations Sec.36.211 Maintenance of accessible  
18 features. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint,  
19 Defendants failed to provide and then maintain any accessible features in its parking,  
20 path of travel, on or off the property site for rental services and website rental  
21 services. Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants  
22 discriminated against the named Plaintiffs in violation of this provision.  
23

24 **CLAIM XIII: Association**

25 47. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint,  
26 Plaintiffs are informed, believe, and thereon allege that Defendants discriminated  
27

1 against the named Plaintiffs in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(E)  
2

3 **DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS**

4 FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION: ONLY THE INDIVIDUALL NAMED  
5 PLAINTIFF AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS - **CLAIMS UNDER CALIFORNIA**  
6 **ACCESSIBILITY LAWS**

7 **CLAIM I: Denial Of Full And Equal Access**

8 48. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint, the  
9 named Individual Plaintiff was denied full and equal access to Defendants' goods.  
10 services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations within a public  
11 accommodation owned, leased, and/or operated by Defendants as required by Civil  
12 Code Sections 54, 54.1, and specifically 54.1(d). The factual basis for this claim is at  
13 18-28 above.

14 **CLAIM II: Failure To Modify Practices, Policies And Procedures**

15 49. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint,  
16 the named Individual Plaintiff was denied full and equal access to Defendants' goods.  
17 Defendants failed and refused to provide a reasonable alternative by modifying its  
18 practices, policies, and procedures in that they failed to have a scheme, plan, or  
19 design to assist Plaintiff Members and/or others similarly situated in entering and  
20 utilizing Defendants' services as required by Civil Code § 54.1. The factual basis for  
21 this claim is at 18-28 above.

22 **CLAIM III: Violation Of The Unruh Act**

23 50. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint,  
24 the individual, the named Individual Plaintiff was denied full and equal access to  
25 Defendants' goods. Defendants violated the CA Civil Code § 51 by specifically  
26 failing to comply with Civil Code §51(f). Defendants' facility violated state  
27 disability laws, the ANSI Standards, A117, and California's Title 24 Accessible  
28

1 Building Code by failing to provide equal access to Defendants' facilities.  
2 Defendants did and continue to discriminate against Plaintiff Members in violation  
3 of Civil Code §§ 51(f), and 52. The factual basis for this claim is at 18-28 above.  
4

**Treble Damages Pursuant To California Accessibility Laws**

5 51. Based on the facts plead at ¶¶ 8 - 26 above and elsewhere in this complaint,  
6 only the named Individual Plaintiff prays for an award of treble damages against  
7 Defendants, and each of them, pursuant to California Civil Code sections 52(a) and  
8 54.3(a). Defendants, each of them respectively, at times prior to and including the  
9 day the named Individual Plaintiff attempted patronized Defendants' facilities and  
10 rental services, and continuing to the present time, knew that persons with physical  
11 disabilities were denied their rights of equal access. Despite such knowledge,  
12 Defendants, and each of them, failed and refused to take steps to comply with the  
13 applicable access statutes; and despite knowledge of the resulting problems and  
14 denial of civil rights thereby suffered by the named Individual Plaintiff. Defendants,  
15 and each of them, have failed and refused to take action to grant full and equal access  
16 to the individual Plaintiff in the respects complained of hereinabove. Defendants,  
17 and each of them, have carried out a course of conduct of refusing to respond to, or  
18 correct complaints about, denial of disabled access and have refused to comply with  
19 their legal obligations to make Defendants' public accommodation facilities and  
20 rental services accessible pursuant to the ADAAG and Title 24 of the California  
21 Code of Regulations (also known as the California Building Code). Such actions  
22 and continuing course of conduct by Defendants in conscious disregard of the rights  
23 and/or safety of the named Individual Plaintiff justify an award of treble damages  
24 pursuant to sections 52(a) and 54.3(a) of the California Civil Code.  
25

**26 DEMAND FOR JUDGMENT FOR RELIEF:**

27 A. All named Plaintiffs seeks injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3613(c) and  
28

1 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a). Only the named Individual Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief  
 2 pursuant to CA Civil Code §52. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3613(c), all Plaintiffs request  
 3 this court to enjoin Defendants to cease their discriminatory practices in housing  
 4 rental services, rental housing management services, and for Defendants to  
 5 implement written policies and methods to respond to reasonable accommodation  
 6 and reasonable modification requests. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), Plaintiffs  
 7 request this Court enjoin Defendants to remove all barriers to equal access to the  
 8 disabled Plaintiffs in, at, or on their facilities, including but not limited to  
 9 architectural and communicative barriers in the provision of Defendants' rental  
 10 services. Plaintiffs do not seek injunctive relief pursuant to Cal. Civil Code §55 and  
 11 Plaintiffs do not seek attorneys' fees pursuant to Cal. Civil Code §55. Plaintiffs do  
 12 not seek any relief at all pursuant to Cal. Civil Code §55.

- 13 B. All named Plaintiffs seek actual damages pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3613(c).  
 14 However, Plaintiff Club only seeks damages for itself. Plaintiff Club does not seek  
 15 damages on behalf of its members;
- 16 C. Only the named Individual Plaintiff seeks recovery of actual damages pursuant  
 17 to Cal. Civil Code §§ 52 or 54.3;
- 18 D. Only the named Individual Plaintiff seeks \$4,000 in minimum statutory  
 19 damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 52 for each and every offense of Civil Code §  
 20 51, pursuant to Munson v. Del Taco, (June 2009) 46 Cal. 4th 661;
- 21 E. In the alternative to the damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 52 in Paragraph  
 22 C above, only the named individual Plaintiff seeks \$1,000 in minimum statutory  
 23 damages pursuant to Cal. Civil Code § 54.3 for each and every offense of Civil Code  
 24 § 54.1;
- 25 F. All named Plaintiffs seek attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3613(c)(2), 42  
 26 U.S.C. § 12205, and Cal. Civil Code §§ 52, 54.3;
- 27 G. Only the named individual Plaintiff seeks treble damages pursuant to Cal.

1 Civil Code §§ 52(a) or 54.3(a);

2 H. The named Plaintiffs are seeking perspective injunctive relief to require the  
3 Defendants to provide obvious reasonable accommodations, to provide the required  
4 auxiliary aids and to modify Defendants' procedures, practices, and policies of the  
5 Defendants in the provision of Defendants' rental services. Without perspective  
6 relief the Plaintiffs will suffer future harm.

7 I. All named Plaintiffs seek a Jury Trial and;

8 J. For such other further relief as the court deems proper.

9  
10 Respectfully submitted:

11 LIGHTNING LAW, APC

12 Dated: December 10, 2023

13 By: /s/David C. Wakefield  
14 DAVID C. WAKEFIELD, ESQ.  
15 Attorney for Plaintiffs